

Delegated Report

Business Manager Lead: Lisa Hughes – Planning Development

Lead Officer: Isabel Verheul, Planner, Isabel.Verheul@newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk, 01636 655860

Report Summary			
Application Number	22/00874/HOUSE		
Proposal	Extension and refurbishment works to farmhouse. (Part retrospective)		
Location	Meadow Farm, Greaves Lane, Edingley, Nottinghamshire, NG22 8BL		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Smith	Agent	Izzy Rhodes – Swain Architecture
Web Link	https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=RBBB3MLBKQA00		
Registered	6 May 2022	Target Date	1 July 2022
		Extension of Time	14 December 2022
Recommendation	That planning permission is REFUSED for the reason set out in Section 10		

This application is being referred to the Planning Committee for determination by the local ward member, Councillor Penny Rainbow due to the application being supported by the Parish Council and it is considered that the porch is in keeping and appropriate to the conversion.

1.0 The Site

The site relates to a former farmhouse located to the south of Greaves Lane. The dwelling currently has many alterations and extensions which do not benefit from planning permission.

Prior to the unauthorised works, the property comprised a historic traditional farmhouse, with a characteristic cat slide roof to the front elevation.



Google Maps July 2009

The site lies in the open countryside to the south-west of Edingley village but within its parish boundary. The site is surrounded by agricultural land, pasture and meadowland which has woodland copses and mature hedgerows forming field boundaries amongst a rolling and undulating landscape.

Meadow Farm is no longer in agricultural use and adjacent to the farmhouse is a U-shaped group of single storey brick and pantile barns, creating an internal courtyard and is owned by the applicants. Meadow Barn (a two storey former threshing barn) lies to north-west of the farm complex; this was converted to residential at some point after consent was granted in 1988 and is in separate ownership.

The land rises to the south within the site, thus the existing buildings are set above the ground level of the highway.

A public right of way (Footpath no. 9) is located to the east of site and crosses the site in the north-eastern corner, extending from north to the south-east where it connects with byway (open to all traffic) no. 22. A footpath (Footpath no. 10) extends on the opposite side of Greaves Lane heading northwards across the landscape.

The site lies within flood zone 1 according to the Environment Agency Maps, which means it is at low risk of fluvial flooding.

2.0 Relevant Planning History

- **21/01555/FUL** - *Proposed 2 storey extension to existing farmhouse with internal reconfiguration and conversion of brick built courtyard complex of barns to form ancillary accommodation associated with existing farmhouse.*

Application Refused 19th October 2021 in respect of the proposed extensions/alterations to Meadow Farm for the following reason:

“The proposed extensions to Meadow Farm by virtue of their design, form, scale and materials would detrimentally alter the character of the host dwelling and result in an unsympathetic development with conflicting design elements proposed. For example the proposed gable width, bulk and roof form of the two storey rear extension does not respect the proportions of the host dwelling, the front dormer windows unacceptably punctuate and harm the plane of the traditional catslide roof, the proposed porch represents an incongruous addition, overly wide and with a poorly positioned window and the single storey rear extension appears to be out of proportion, overlapping and creating a jarred junction with the host dwelling that it sits against, all of which is exacerbated by the choice of proposed materials (timber cladding) which would not reflect the vernacular of the host dwelling. These proposed extensions would lead to unacceptable, cumulative, adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the open countryside and the proposal is therefore considered contrary to Core Policy 9 in the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (adopted March 2019) and Policies DM5 (Design) and DM6 (Householder Development) of the Newark & Sherwood Allocations & Development Management DPD (adopted July 2013). The proposal would also be contrary to the

advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Householder Development SPD which are material planning considerations.”

- **20/01108/FUL** - *Proposed residential conversion of traditional agricultural barns to one dwelling and erection of 2no. new dwellings (in lieu of those consented under 19/00516/CPRIOR and 19/01122/CPRIOR).* Application Refused 20th October 2020.
- **19/01122/CPRIOR** - *Notification for Prior Approval for a Proposed Change of Use of Agricultural Building to dwellinghouse and for associated operational development.* Prior Approval is not required 25th July 2019;
- **19/00516/CPRIOR** - *Notification for Prior Approval for a Proposed Change of Use of Agricultural Building to dwellinghouse and for associated operational development.* Application Permitted 3rd May 2019;
- **37890365** – *Conversion of farm buildings to dwelling.* Application Permitted 26th October 1989.

3.0 The Proposal

This application sets out to regularise and amend the unauthorised extensions and alterations already made to the farmhouse, carried out without the benefit of planning permission. Apart from the new sunroom, similar development already undertaken to the dwellinghouse were refused under application 21/01555/FUL, in October 2021 for the reasons set out in the planning history section above.

The authorised dwelling comprised two main reception rooms, kitchen, bathroom, one smaller room, entrance porch and garage at ground floor level and three double bedrooms with one en-suite and a bathroom at first floor level. The proposed plans comprise lounge, dining room, sunroom, open plan living area including kitchen, dining and seating area, utility, pantry, boot room, entrance porch and 5th bedroom/office served by a toilet and four double bedrooms, two ensuites and one bathroom at first floor level. The proposed additions/alterations have been set out below under the headings of front and rear elevations.

Front Elevation



Front Elevation of farmhouse prior to unauthorised works being undertaken

The front elevation of the dwelling, now currently accommodates two **unauthorised** dormers within the catslide roof, a porch, a sunroom to the side elevation and the conversion of the garage to living accommodation (replacing garage door with new timber cladding and domestic window. This proposal seeks planning permission to retain these elements, with modifications to the porch. Each element is set out below.

Single storey side extension (sun room) with dual pitched roof dominated by glazing to the front elevation. Dimensions: depth – 4.5m, width – 4.5m, height (eaves) – 2.1m, height (ridge) – 3.8m. Materials: deep brick plinth, timber cladding, glazing, tiled roof.

Porch with lean-to roof. Dimensions: depth - 1.1m, width – 2.6m, height (eaves) – 2.4m, height (ridge) – 3m. Materials: shallow brick plinth, timber cladding and tiled roof.

The submitted proposed plans show a reduced ridge height compared to that already built.

Dormers with dual pitched roofs. Dimensions (individually): depth(max) 2.8m, width - 1.4m height (ridge) – 2m Materials: Timber cladding and tiled roof.

One dormer serves a bathroom and the other a full height void with landing set back behind.

In relation to the front elevation of the garage conversion although it has been clad in timber, this application proposes to alter this material to brick.

Front Elevation Now Proposed:



The agent has stated that the amended porch design and unauthorised sun room would comply with the Permitted Development rules so are exempt from requiring planning permission. However, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A (enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse) of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) has the following condition:

“A.3 *Development is permitted by Class A subject to the following conditions—*

(a)the materials used in any exterior work (other than materials used in the construction of a conservatory) must be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse”

The use of a timber clad finish for this element means that both the porch and the sun room do not comply with the above condition of Class A of the General Permitted Development

Order and therefore both require planning permission and are required to be assessed as part of this application.

Rear Elevation



Rear Elevation of farmhouse prior to unauthorised works being undertaken

To the rear elevation there is an **unauthorised** two storey rear extension and single storey extension, all finished in timber cladding.

Rear Single Storey Extension with dual pitched roof. Dimensions: Length – 1.8m, Width – 5.3m, Height (eaves) – 2.4m, Height (ridge) – 4.4m. Materials: Timber cladding with tiled roof.

Rear Two Storey Extension with dual pitched roof. Dimensions: Length – 3.7m, Width – 5.2m, Height (eaves) – 4.2m, Height (ridge) – 6.8m. Materials: Currently finished in timber cladding, the submitted plan show this altered to brick, tiled roof.

Rear Elevation Now Proposed:



Comparison to previously refused 21/01555/FUL

Front Elevation



Refused Plan

Porch:

Depth – 1.6m (now 1.1m), *Width* – 2.9m (now 2.6m), *Height (eaves)* – 2.4m (same) , *Height (ridge)* – 3.1m (now 3m)

Rear Elevation



Refused Plan

Rear Single Storey Extension: *Depth* – 1.51m (now 1.8m), *Width* – 3.4m (now 5.3m), *Height (eaves)* – 2.4m (same), *Height (ridge)* - 4.4m (same).

Rear Two Storey Extension: *Depth* – 4m (now 3.7m), *Width* – 5.6m (now 5.2m), *Height (eaves)* – 4m (now 4.2m), *Height (ridge)* – 6.8m (same).

All the windows in the property have been replaced with changes in fenestration (from small pane Georgian style to a single pane subdivided by a single horizontal bar (not accurately presented on the submitted plans) to give a more more modern appearance, as well as amendments to proportions resulting in a more horizontal emphasis - these alterations also require planning permission.

The submitted plans also show a proposed detached double garage and log store which has not yet been constructed. However, having assessed this element it appears to fall within Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E (buildings etc incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse) of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) in the view of officers, and as such the proposed garage would benefit from

deemed consent and does not require express planning permission. As a result, the garage has not been assessed as part of the consideration of this application and an informative would be added to the decision notice to inform the applicants that should they wish to have a legally binding decision on this matter, a lawful development certificate would need to be submitted.

Information submitted as part of this application:

- Application Form. Received 3rd May 2022.
- Existing Dwelling Plans, ref 19.183 S01.04. Received 3rd May 2022.
- Proposed Garage Floor Plans and Elevations, ref 19.183 S03.04. Received 3rd May 2022.
- Proposed Site Location, ref 19.183 S03.05. Received 3rd May 2022.
- Planning Statement. Received 3rd May 2022.
- Existing Dwelling Elevations, ref 19.183 S01.05. Received 6th May 2022.
- Proposed Site Location and Block Plan, ref 19.183 S03.04. Received 20th July 2022.
- Existing and Proposed Site Block Plan, ref 19.183 S03.06. Received 20th July 2022.
- Ground Floor & First Floor, ref 19.183 – S03.01 Rev A. Received 21st November 2022.
- Elevations, ref 19.183 S03.2 Rev A. Received 21st November 2022.
- Elevations, ref 19.183 S03.03 Rev A. Received 21st November 2022.

4.0 Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of one property have been individually notified by letter. A site notice has also been displayed near to the site.

Site Visits undertaken on 11th May and the 7th September 2022.

5.0 Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019)

Core Policy 9 -Sustainable Design

Core Policy 13 – Landscape Character

Allocations & Development Management DPD

DM5 – Design

DM6 – Householder Development

DM12 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Other Material Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework 2021
- National Planning Practice Guidance
- Landscape and Character Assessment SPD 2013
- Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards SPD 2021

6.0 Consultations

Edingley Parish Council – Support Proposal.

Ramblers Association - Nottinghamshire Ramblers wishes to comment that Edingley Footpath 9 (and the Robin Hood Way) adjoins the north-eastern boundary of this application site on land in the same ownership.

The line of Edingley Footpath 9 is indicated on the plans as a thin red line, but not actually identified as such. The Right of Way runs for several metres on the driveway leading to the back of the application site, and this driveway will inevitably be used by construction traffic.

Nottinghamshire Ramblers requests that a guidance note requiring Edingley Footpath 9 to remain open and unobstructed is attached to any planning approval.

NSDC Conservation - We have reviewed the submitted details for this proposal and have decided we do not wish to offer any formal comments.

Meadow Farmhouse isn't identified on the Nottinghamshire HER and is much altered and therefore does not meet the districts non-designated heritage asset criteria (2022).

Whilst we have determined not to comment in this case, it should not be construed that we support the proposal. This is a strictly neutral comment, and does not prejudice any decision made by the Council. If you believe that there is a heritage matter connected to this proposal which requires specialist conservation advice, please do not hesitate to get in touch by emailing conservation@newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk.

5 letters of support have been received as part of this application:

- Meadow Farm has been unoccupied for 5 years and was becoming an eyesore on the Robin Hood Way.
- The works have revived the house and when fully completed will be a credit to the owners and will enhance the appearance of this section of the Lane.
- Materials chosen match other properties in the neighbourhood and clearly define the difference between new and old allowing the original building to assert its character.
- Introduction of greener technologies should be fully encouraged.
- Impressed by the work to upgrade the farmhouse.
- The features such as the dormer windows and timber cladding are sympathetic and add to the original building.
- The property has been skilfully converted and designed to maximise a range of environmentally friendly construction technologies; which is crucial and should be encouraged given the current climate crisis.
- The design and materials are perfect for maintaining the atmosphere, character and environment of Greaves Lane, a vast improvement to what was there before.
- Original property was in poor condition and unsuitable for current use. The upgrade makes the property fit for purpose in 2022 and will enhance the locality.
- Proposal gets full support.
- The design has been sensitively considered to its neighbouring properties.
- Support of the public footpath remain in use.
- New families should be supported in moving to the village from a social and economic standpoint.

7.0 Comments of the Business Manager

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes the principle of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and recognises the duty under the Planning Acts for planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The NPPF refers to the presumption in favour of sustainable development being at the heart of development and sees sustainable development as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. This is confirmed at the development plan level under Policy DM12 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD.

Principle of Development

Policy DM6 accepts householder development in principle providing that the proposal meets site specific criteria regarding impact on residential amenity and the character of the area.

Policy DM5 states development should be accepted providing it does not result in loss of amenity in terms of overbearing impacts, loss of light and privacy. It also states that the local distinctiveness of the character of built form should be reflected in the scale, form, mass, layout, design, materials and detailing of proposals for new development.

Policy DM12 of the DPD states 'A positive approach to considering development proposals will be taken that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework... The Development Plan is the statutory starting point for decision making. Planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Newark and Sherwood (including, where relevant, policies in Neighbourhood Development Plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'

Impact on the Open Countryside and the Host Dwelling

A Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) has been prepared to inform the policy approach identified within Core Policy 13 of the Core Strategy. The LCA has recognised a series of Policy Zones across the five Landscape Character types represented across the District.

The site falls within Policy Zone Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands PZ 37 (Halam Village Farmlands with Ancient Woodlands). This area is described as *'an area of rolling and undulating topography resulting in medium to long distance views towards frequently wooded skylines, interrupted intermittently by pylons and power lines running east-west to the south of the area. It is a predominantly arable agricultural landscape with medium to large scale fields of irregular geometric pattern, smaller scale pastoral fields with some horseyculture are also apparent, generally closer to settlements.'*

The land to the south rises quite dramatically giving the farm a hillside backdrop whilst falling to the north. Across this landscape are a number of footpaths offering medium to long distance views of the site. Landscape condition in this area is very good; it is a unified area with few detracting features with landscape sensitivity defined as high giving a 'conserve'

policy action as set out in CP13. Any built features should maintain use of vernacular materials, style and scale and measures should be promoted to reinforce the traditional character of existing farm buildings using vernacular building styles. I shall assess the proposal against these criteria further below.

Policy DM6 states that planning permission will be granted for householder development provided that the proposal reflects the character of the area and existing dwelling in terms of design and materials. Policy DM5 requires any new development to achieve a high standard of design and layout that is of an appropriate form and scale whilst complementing the existing local distinctiveness and built and landscape character.

Paragraph 7.4 of the Householder Development SPD talks about how the overall objective for any proposal should be the successful integration with the host dwelling and the surrounding area, ensuring the addition respects the scale and character of the host dwelling.

The Householder Development SPD provides guidance on how to assess front elevation additions in terms of their impact on the appearance of the property and character of the surrounding area. The proposal must not introduce a dominant feature by virtue of its scale, proportions and/or detailing which would be harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

The front elevation additions to Meadow Farm are visible from Greaves Lane. The dormer windows protrude out of the existing cat slide roof. This roofscape is characteristic of an historic farmhouse and is considered to be an attractive traditional feature. Dormer windows do not form part of the cottage vernacular and whilst the catslide roof would still be read, these modern features punctuate and interrupt the simple plane of the catslide roofline. Although appropriate in form and not disproportionately large in themselves, their incongruous timber cladding represents a harsh contrast and their prominent positioning result in additions that detract from and are not in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling or surrounding area. In addition to this, the proposed porch provides an additional 'boxy,' overly wide addition which again is finished in timber cladding which is again contrary to the guidance contained within the Householder Development SPD. Amendments are proposed to this element from the previously refused application, which decreases the depth and overall height of the porch however the sentiment remains the same. The timber clad porch represents another incongruous feature on the principle elevation of the vernacular farmhouse which contributes cumulatively to the overall harm to its character and appearance and are therefore considered to be contrary to the Householder Development SPD.

Whilst the form and scale of the sunroom on the side elevation is considered to be appropriate, the timber cladding represents yet another incongruous finish and harsh contrast to the vernacular brick that represents local distinctiveness of traditional buildings within the District which detracts from and are not in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling or surrounding area. Whilst the front elevation of the sunroom is dominated with glazing, above a brick plinth, the fenestration detailing is traditional and when viewed in context with the rest of the front elevation of the cottage, would not result in a harmful appearance. The side elevation being partly glazed and partly timber clad results in an imbalanced appearance that would not reflect a traditional treatment. Should this

element have been applied for, prior to construction, it would have been advised that the extension be finished in matching brickwork to respect the traditional character of the host dwelling, however the timber clad finish contributes to the overall cumulative harm.

The converted garage space is proposed to be altered from timber cladding to have brick as the facing material which is a welcome change and considered acceptable.

The supplementary planning document (SPD) for householder development states that any addition to the host dwelling should be subservient and the addition should be designed to be subordinate in scale to the main dwelling and not form an overly dominant feature. The rear extensions are not visible from Greaves Lane, however they are visible to the users of the footpath, which runs adjacent to the site. The proportions of the two storey addition would be in conflict with the host dwelling as the gable width is greater than that of the main cottage which results in a flatter roof pitch and a horizontal emphasis, that dominates. The height of ridge and eaves would not be sufficiently subservient to reflect the form, proportions and character of the traditional farmhouse; these issues were also raised as part of 21/01555/FUL. The two storey extension would therefore harm the traditional character and appearance of the vernacular farmhouse and when viewed from the public footpath. The application proposes an amendment to remove the timber as a facing material to this element and replace it with matching brickwork. Whilst this material change would assist in a greater assimilation and better reflect the character of the existing cottage, it is not considered that this amendment overcomes the issues raised in terms of proportions, roof pitch and massing.

The rear single storey extension (to the rear of the converted garage) is again considered to be poorly designed. Its gable sits wider than the single storey element it is viewed against. This overhang of the eaves creates further conflict with the clean lines of the rear elevation. This harm to the character is further exacerbated by the use of the timber materials. Again, the design of this element and the harm it would have on the traditional character of the property was identified as part of 21/01555/FUL and this application is now seeking permission for a deeper and wider addition than previously.

Since the previous refusal (21/01555/FUL) new windows and doors have been installed on the property. Whilst the fenestration details and proportions of openings have changed giving a more horizontal emphasis which does further erode the character to some extent, it is not considered that this in itself is sufficiently harmful to add to the reason for refusal of permission.

To conclude, the scale, proportions and materials of the additions proposed would cumulatively erode and be unacceptably harmful to the vernacular character and appearance of the farmhouse which contributes positively to the distinctiveness of the wider area. The cumulative overall scheme would be contrary to Core Policy 9 and 13 of the Amended Core Strategy, Policy DM6 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD, the Householder Development SPD, as well as the NPPF which is a material consideration.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy required proposals to demonstrate a high standard of sustainable design. Policy DM5 of the DPD states that development proposals should ensure no unacceptable reduction in amenity including overbearing impacts and loss of privacy upon

neighbouring development.

I do not consider the alterations to the farmhouse impact upon Meadow Barn (neighbouring property). No elements of the proposal are considered to be overbearing or intrusive in line with the above assessment. Due to the separation distances, there would be no loss of light caused by the proposal. The first floor window proposed as part of the two storey extension would be positioned approximately 24.4m from Meadow Barn and therefore I have no concerns in regards to overlooking or privacy implications. This elevation of Meadow Barn is blank, bar one glazed window at ground floor level and I am satisfied that the proposal would not adversely impact the existing and future residents of the dwelling due to the separation distances.

Other Matters

The use of greener technologies are encouraged by the Local Planning Authority. In this instance, it is not considered the sustainability benefits of new double glazing outweigh the harm caused to the character of the building and surrounding area. The suggested use of ground source heat pump or photovoltaic panels as stated within the Planning Statement were not evident on site, nor on the plans and therefore have not been assessed as part of this application.

Spatial Policy 7 (Sustainable Transport) states that high quality footpath networks will be safeguarded for cycling, walking and horse riding for recreation in the countryside. NCC Rights of Way have not commented on the application in regards to the impact on Edingley Public Footpath No.9. It is not considered the proposal will affect the walked line or the legally recorded definitive line. Given this, I am satisfied that the proposal would not adversely impact the existing public footpath network and is therefore acceptable.

8.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations officers have considered the following implications; Data Protection, Equality and Diversity, Financial, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding, Sustainability, and Crime and Disorder and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

9.0 Conclusion

The proposal, as built fails to accord with Policies CP9, CP13 of the Amended Core Strategy, DM5 and DM6 of the ADMDPD as well as the Householder Development SPD and Landscape Character Assessment SPD. By virtue of their scale, proportions and materials, the proposed extensions to Meadow Farm would detrimentally alter the character of the traditional vernacular farmhouse and would result in incongruous additions that would conflict with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, even with the proposed amendments to the scale of the porch and use of facing materials to the two storey rear extension and garage conversion and is contrary to both local and national policy as highlighted within this report.

10.0 Recommendation

The planning permission is refused for the following reason:

01

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed extensions to Meadow Farm would by virtue of their scale, proportions and materials would detrimentally alter the character of the traditional vernacular farmhouse and would result in incongruous additions that would conflict with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. For example, the gable width, bulk and roof pitch of the two storey rear extension would not respect the proportions of the host dwelling, the front dormer windows would unacceptably punctuate and harm the plane of the traditional catslide roof, the porch would represent an overly wide incongruous addition and the single storey rear extension would appear out of proportion, overlapping and creating a jarred junction with the host dwelling that it sits against, all of which is exacerbated by the choice of materials (timber cladding) which would not reflect the vernacular of the host dwelling.

The proposed extensions would lead cumulatively to unacceptable adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding landscape character. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Core Policy 9 and Core Policy 13 in the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (adopted March 2019) and Policies DM5 (Design) and DM6 (Householder Development) of the Newark & Sherwood Allocations & Development Management DPD (adopted July 2013) as well as the Householder Development SPD (2014) and Landscape Character Assessment SPD (2013). The proposal is also contrary to the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and which is a material planning consideration.

Informatives

01

The application is clearly contrary to the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, as detailed in the above reason(s) for refusal. However the District Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant to make some revisions to the proposal. Whilst not all problems arising can be overcome, several potential reasons for refusal have been negated.

02

You are advised that as of 1st December 2011, the Newark and Sherwood Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule came into effect. Whilst the above application has been refused by the Local Planning Authority you are advised that CIL applies to all planning permissions granted on or after this date. Thus any successful appeal against this decision may therefore be subject to CIL (depending on the location and type of development proposed). Full details are available on the Council's website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/

03

The garage and log shed shown on 'Proposed Garage Floor Plans and Elevations' ref 19.183 S03.04 would appear to be lawful complying with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and has therefore not been considered as part of this proposal due to a local planning authority not lawfully being able to make a decision on a matter which is already the subject of a decision prescribed in statute i.e. the development order. Should a formal decision be required, you are advised to submit an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness.

04

Refused Plans:

- Proposed Site Location, ref 19.183 S03.05. Received 3rd May 2022.
- Proposed Site Location and Block Plan, ref 19.183 S03.04. Received 20th July 2022.
- Existing and Proposed Site Block Plan, ref 19.183 S03.06. Received 20th July 2022.
- Ground Floor & First Floor, ref 19.183 – S03.01 Rev A. Received 21st November 2022.
- Elevations, ref 19.183 S03.2 Rev A. Received 21st November 2022.
- Elevations, ref 19.183 S03.03 Rev A. Received 21st November 2022.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

Committee Plan - 22/00874/HOUSE

